



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/698,448

11/03/2003

David Sparrowe

MERCK-2775

3497

23599

7590

02/19/2008

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.

2200 CLARENDON BLVD.

SUITE 1400

ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

LISTVOYB, GREGORY

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/19/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/698,448	Applicant(s) SPARROWE ET AL.	
	Examiner GREGORY LISTVOYB	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 and 21-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/17/2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for melamine-formaldehyde resins (see Examples), does not reasonably provide enablement for any other amine –containing material. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Art Unit: 1796

Factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described by the court in *re Wands*, 8 USPQ 2d 1400 (CA FC 1988). *Wands* states at page 1404, the court set forth eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApl 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

(1) The nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working example and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary.

The nature of the invention and breadth of claims

The claimed invention is an electronic device, which predominantly contain melamine-formaldehyde resin. Therefore, the scope of the Claims ("organic amine derivative", multifunctional polymeric compound and initiator, meaning any amine derivative, any multifunctional polymeric compound and any initiator) is much broader than one disclosed in the Specification.

The state of the prior art

Art Unit: 1796

In the prior art to US 2001/0025414 as discussed below, a multilayered wiring board (electronic device, see Abstract) comprising Methoxymethylolmelamine (Cymel 370, see line 99). Therefore, US 2001/0025414 reference represents only a limited teaching of cross-linkable Melamine-containing material for used for electronic device.

The presence or absence of working example:

. Only Melamine-formaldehyde-based amines presented in Examples.

There is no Component B presented.

Note that the working example is critical factor to be considered, especially in a case involving an unpredictable and undeveloped art such as analysis of film anisotropy with humidity expansion parameter. See MPEP 2164.

The quantity of experimentation necessary.

2. It is concluded that it would have require undue experimentation for one having ordinary skill in the art to practice the claimed invention to find appropriate step to expand the applicant's teaching to any other type of amines, besides one based on Melamine-formaldehyde-based amines. The above is applicable to a multifunctional organic compound

Art Unit: 1796

and an initiator. In re Wands, 858, F.2d at 737, 8 USPQ 2d 1400, 1404 (Fed Cir. 1988).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 6 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Toyoshima et al (US 2001/0025414), herein Toyoshima.

Toyoshima discloses a multilayered wiring board (electronic device, see Abstract) comprising Methoxymethylolmelamine (Cymel 370, see line 99), which is capable of forming a crosslinked polymer with itself and/or with at least one multifunctional compound and polyvinyl acetal, which is reactive derivative from polyvinyl alcohol, which has Hydroxyl groups (see line 0099, Example 1). The above components comprise at least 75%wt of the total composition.

In addition, Toyoshima teaches water soluble melamine-type cross-linking agents (see line 0063) and water insoluble siloxane, melamine resins, acrylate resins , etc (see line 0067).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-5, 7-17, 21-30, 33, 38-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toyoshima or Knudsen (US 2002/0176989, cited in the previous Office Action) herein Knudsen in combination with Chen et al (US patent 5330840, cited in the previous Office Action) herein Chen.

Toyoshima discloses a multilayered wiring board (electronic device, see Abstract) comprising Methoxymethylolmelamine (Cymel 370, see line 99), which is capable of forming a crosslinked polymer with itself and/or with at least one multifunctional compound and polyvinyl acetal, which is reactive derivative from polyvinyl alcohol, which has Hydroxyl groups (see line 0099, Example 1). The above components comprise at least 75%wt of the total composition.

In addition, Toyoshima teaches water soluble melamine-type cross-linking agents (see line 0063) and water insoluble siloxane, melamine resins, acrylate resins, etc (see line 0067).

Art Unit: 1796

Knudsen discloses a cross-linked polyurethane based material used as a dielectric layer in printed circuit boards and other electronic devices (Abstract, line 0031 line 0051), which can contain ceramic materials (see line 0019).

The above ceramics increase dielectric resistance of the coating.

Toyoshima or Knudsen do not teach exact amine derivative as a crosslinked agent as claimed in claim 2.

Chen discloses a composition formed with cross-linkable melamine formaldehyde resin 2-80% of Cymel 303 as well as Cymel 380 and 385 (Column 6, line 5 and Claim 3), which is identical to one used in the Application examined (see page 24, mixture M1 of the Application), 25-60% of polyurethane-siloxane (Column 6, line 5 and Claim 1), 0.001-1% of acid catalyst (Column 7, line 5, meeting the limitations Claims 30 and 39) and a solvent.

In reference to Claim 16 and newly added Claims 29, 40 and 44, Chen discloses the use of 1,4 butanediol (see Table).

Regarding Claim 33, Chen discloses a solvent THF (i.e. ether).

In reference to Claim 41, Chen discloses a coating with thickness of 0.5-50 um (see Column 7, line 30).

Art Unit: 1796

Since Chen's composition has an excellent flexibility, adhesion to a metal surface and low dielectric constant, it would be obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art to use it in Toyoshima/Knudsen's electronic device, including circuit boards.

Regarding Claim 42, Knudsen and Chen do not disclose dielectric layer with dielectric constant greater or equal 4.

However, since Chen's composition essentially has the same base material (i.e. up to 80% of Cymel) and thickness of 0.5-50 μm , it has the same dielectric properties as the dielectric of the Application examined.

Claims 31-37 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Knudsen or Toyoshima in view of Chen and further view of Barancyk et al (US 2004/0044165) herein Barancyk.

Knudsen or Toyoshima discloses a cross-linked polyurethane based material used as a dielectric layer in an electronic device (see discussion above).

Chen discloses a composition formed with cross-linkable melamine coating (see discussion above).

Knudsen or Toyoshima and Chen do not disclose para-toluene sulphonic acid as a catalyst, surfactant and a butanol as a solvent.

Barancyk discloses a coating composition based on siloxanes (see line 0027), urethanes (see line 0049), diols (line 0061) and cross-linking agent, based on Cymel (see line 0082). Note that Barancyk's composition includes the same ingredients as Chen's one.

Barancyk uses para-toluene sulphonic acid as a catalyst (see line 0215). The advantage of the above catalyst compare to TFA used by Chen is that para-toluene sulphonic acid has much higher boiling point, making possible high temperature cure.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to use para-toluene sulphonic acid as a catalyst to perform high temperature curing process.

Barancyk uses 5-80% of butanol and ketones as a solvent (see lines 0213- 0214). Butanol is a commonly used solvent with hydrophilic-lipophilic properties. The advantage of butanol over THF or chlorinated hydrocarbons used by Chen is its lower toxicity and price.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to use butanol as a solvent in Chen's composition, due to its lower toxicity and price.

Art Unit: 1796

Barancyk uses polyoxyethylene (Pluronic) as a surface active agent (see line 0199). The use of the above agent allows better contact between the composition and a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skills in the art to use polyoxyethylene (Pluronic) as a surface active agent in Chen's composition, providing better contact between a substrate and the composition.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Chen, the Applicant argues that there is no disclosure of the dielectric constant or resistivity of layers formed from the coating composition. However, as stated above, since Chen's composition essentially has the same base material (i.e. up to 80% of Cymel) and thickness of 0.5-50 um, it has the same dielectric properties as the dielectric of the Application examined.

Regarding Knudsen, the Applicant argues that it is evident that this is a vast grouping of polymers. It is noted that polyurethanes are included within this extremely broad genus. However, it would have been obvious to a person of

Art Unit: 1796

ordinary skills in the art that virtually any of them can be used in the composition with reasonable expectation of success.

The Applicant argues that polyorganosiloxanes are not included in the list above. The new Toyoshima reference presents polyorganosiloxanes as an insulating material in electronic devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to GREGORY LISTVOYB whose telephone number is (571)272-6105. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vasu Jagannathan can be reached on 571-272-1119. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.2

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GL

/Rabon Sergent/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796